SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT - UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE Case Number

THIS FORM IS TO BE SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

Your case is assigned for all purposes to the judicial officer indicated below (Local Rule 7.3©). There is additional information on the reverse side of this for

| ASSIGNED JUDGE | DEPT | ROOM | ASSIGNED JUDGE | DEPT | ROOM |
|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|-------|
| Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl | 1 | 534 | Hon. Holly E. Kendig | 42 | 416 |
| Hon. J. Stephen Czuleger | 3 | 224 | Hon, Mel Red Recana | 45 | 529 |
| Hon. Luis A. Lavin | 13 | 630 | Hon. Debre Katz Weintraub | 4.7 | 507 |
| Hon. Terry A. Green | 14 | 300 | Hon, Elizabeth Allen White | 48 | 506 |
| Hon. Richard Fruin | 15 | 307 | Hon. Deirdre Hill | 49 | 509 |
| Hon. Rita Miller | 16 . | 306 | Hon. John Shepard Wiley Jr. | 50 | 508 |
| Hon. Richard E. Rico | 17 | 309 | Hon. Abraham Khan | 51 | 511 |
| Hon. Rex Heeseman | 19 | 311 | Hon. Susan Bryant-Deason | 52 | 510 |
| Hon. Kevin C. Brazile | 20 | 310 | Hon. John P. Shook | 53 | 513 |
| Hon. Zaven V. Sinanian | . 23 | 315 | Hon. Ernest M. Hiroshige | 54 | 512 |
| Hon. Robert L. Hess | 24 | 314 | Hon, Malcolm H. Mackey | 55 | 515 |
| Hon. Mary Ann Murphy | 25 | 317 | Hon. Michael Johnson | 56 | 514 |
| Hon, James R. Dunn | 26 | 316 | Hon. Ralph W. Dau | 57 | 517 |
| Hon. Yvette M. Palazuelos | 28 | 318 | Hon, Rolf M. Treu | 58 | 516 |
| Hon. John A. Kronstadt | 30 | 400 | Hon. David L. Minning | ,61 | 632 |
| Hon. Alan S. Rosenfield | 31 | 407 | Hon. Michael L. Stern | 62 | 600 |
| Hon. Mary H. Strobel | 32 | 406 | Hon. Kenneth R. Freeman | 64 | 601 |
| Hon. Charles F. Palmer | 33 | 409 | Hon. Mark Mooney | 68 | 617 |
| Hon. Amy D. Hogue | 34 | 408 | Hon. Ramona See | 69 | 621 |
| Hon. Daniel Buckley | 35 | 411 | Hon. Soussan G. Bruguera | 71 | 729 |
| Hon. Gregory Alarcon | 36 | 410 | Hon. Ruth Ann Kwan | 72 | 731 |
| Hon. Joanne O'Donnell | . 37 | 413 | Hon. Teresa Sanchez-Gordon | 74 | 735 |
| Hon. Maureen Duffy-Lewis | 38 | 412 | Hon. Willliam F. Fahey | 78 | . 730 |
| Hon. Michael C. Solner | 39 | 415 | Hon. Emilie H. Elias* | 324 | CCW |
| Hon. Michelle R. Rosenblatt | 40 | 414 | other | | |
| Hon. Ronald M. Sohigian | 41 | 417 | | | |

*Class Actions

All class actions are initially assigned to Judge Emilie H. Elias in Department 324 of the Central Civil West Courthouse (600 S.Commonwealth Ave., Los Angeles 9000 This assignment is for the purpose of assessing whether or not the case is complex within the meaning of California Rules of Court, rule 3.400. Depending on the Outcome of that assessment, the class action case may be reassigned to one of the judges of the Complex Litigation Program or reassigned randomly to a court in the Central District.

| Given to the Plaintiff/Cross-Complainant/A | attorney of Record on | JOHN A. CLARKE, Executive Officer/Clerk | |
|---|---|---|------|
| LACIV CCH 190 (Rev. 04/10) LASC Approved 05-06 | NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNME UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE | By, Deputy C | ler. |

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR) INFORMATION PACKAGE

[CRC 3.221 Information about Alternative Dispute Resolution]

For additional ADR information and forms visit the Court ADR web application at www.lasuperiorcourt.org (click on ADR).

The plaintiff shall serve a copy of this Information Package on each defendant along with the complaint (Civil only).

What is ADR:

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is the term used to describe all the other options available for settling a dispute which once had to be settled in court. ADR processes, such as arbitration, mediation, neutral evaluation (NE), and settlement conferences, are less formal than a court process and provide opportunities for parties to reach an agreement using a problem-solving approach.

There are many different kinds of ADR. All of them utilize a "neutral", an impartial person, to decide the case or help the parties reach an agreement.

Mediation:

In mediation, a neutral person called a "mediator" helps the parties try to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of the dispute. The mediator does not decide the dispute but helps the parties communicate so they can try to settle the dispute themselves. Mediation leaves control of the outcome with the parties.

Cases for Which Mediation May Be Appropriate

Mediation may be particularly useful when parties have a dispute between or among family members, neighbors, or business partners. Mediation is also effective when emotions are getting in the way of resolution. An effective mediator can hear the parties out and help them communicate with each other in an effective and nondestructive manner.

Cases for Which Mediation May Not Be Appropriate

Mediation may not be effective if one of the parties is unwilling to cooperate or compromise. Mediation also may not be effective if one of the parties has a significant advantage in power over the other. Therefore, it may not be a good choice if the parties have a history of abuse or victimization.

Arbitration:

In arbitration, a neutral person called an "arbitrator" hears arguments and evidence from each side and then decides the outcome of the dispute. Arbitration is less formal than a trial, and the rules of evidence are often relaxed. Arbitration may be either "binding" or "nonbinding." *Binding arbitration* means that the parties waive their right to a trial and agree to accept the arbitrator's decision as final. *Nonbinding* arbitration means that the parties are free to request a trial if they do not accept the arbitrator's decision.

Cases for Which Arbitration May Be Appropriate

Arbitration is best for cases where the parties want another person to decide the outcome of their dispute for them but would like to avoid the formality, time, and expense of a trial. It may also be appropriate for complex matters where the parties want a decision-maker who has training or experience in the subject matter of the dispute.

Cases for Which Arbitration May Not Be Appropriate

If parties want to retain control over how their dispute is resolved, arbitration, particularly binding arbitration, is not appropriate. In binding arbitration, the parties generally cannot appeal the arbitrator's award, even if it is not supported by the evidence or the law. Even in nonbinding arbitration, if a party requests a trial and does not receive a more favorable result at trial than in arbitration, there may be penalties.

Neutral Evaluation:

In neutral evaluation, each party gets a chance to present the case to a neutral person called an "evaluator." The evaluator then gives an opinion on the strengths and weaknesses of each party's evidence and arguments and about how the dispute could be resolved. The evaluator is often an expert in the subject matter of the dispute. Although the evaluator's opinion is not binding, the parties typically use it as a basis for trying to negotiate a resolution of the dispute.

Cases for Which Neutral Evaluation May Be Appropriate

Neutral evaluation may be most appropriate in cases in which there are technical issues that require special expertise to resolve or the only significant issue in the case is the amount of damages.

Cases for Which Neutral Evaluation May Not Be Appropriate

Neutral evaluation may not be appropriate when there are significant personal or emotional barriers to resolving the dispute.

Settlement Conferences:

Settlement conferences may be either mandatory or voluntary. In both types of settlement conferences, the parties and their attorneys meet with a judge or a neutral person called a "settlement officer" to discuss possible settlement of their dispute. The judge or settlement officer does not make a decision in the case but assists the parties in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the case and in negotiating a settlement. Settlement conferences are appropriate in any case where settlement is an option. Mandatory settlement conferences are often held close to the date a case is set for trial.

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

VITAMIN POWER INCORPORATED, DOES 1 through 10

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, a non-profit California corporation

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court

APR 01 2011

John A, Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk DOAYST Read WAIN ormation NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación. Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia. Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso. The name and address of the court is: CASE NUMBER: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Mosk Courthouse BC458576 111 N. Hill St. Los Angeles, CA 90012 The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Gideon Kracov, 801 S. Grand Ave., 11th Fl., Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 629-2071 APR 0 1 2011 DATE: Clerk, by
(Fecha) (Secretario) (Secretario).)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).) , Deputy (Adjunto) (Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)). NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served [SEAL] as an individual defendant. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify): on behalf of (specify):

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California SUM-100 [Rev. July 1, 2009]

SUMMONS

CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)

CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)

CCP 416.10 (corporation)

other (specify): by personal delivery on (date):

Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465

CCP 416.60 (minor)

CCP 416.70 (conservatee)

CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

Page 1 of 1

| 1 2 3 4 5 | 801 S. Grand Avenue, Ste. 1100 | CONFORMED COPY OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Cou APR () 1 2011 John Amerika, Executive 11008 By DOROTHY SWAIN | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE | STATE OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 9 | COUNTY OF LO | S ANGELES | |
| 10 | | BC458576 | |
| 11 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, |) Case No. | |
| 12 | a non-profit California corporation; Plaintiff, | COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE | |
| 13 | | RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES | |
| 14 | V. | Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq. | |
| 15 | VITAMIN POWER INCORPORATED, DOES 1 through 10; | | |
| 16 | Defendant(s). |) | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | Plaintiff Environmental Research Center | r brings this action in the interests of the | |
| 19 | general public and, on information and belief, he | ereby alleges: | |
| 20 | INTROD | UCTION | |
| 21 | This action seeks to remedy Defe | endant(s)' continuing failure to warn thousands | |
| 22 | of consumers in California that they are being ex | | |
| 23 | of California to cause cancer, birth defects and o | | |
| 24 | manufactures, packages, distributes, markets, an | d/or sells in California certain herbal products | |
| 25 | including Ultra Herbal Allergy Aid Capsules, Na | atural Herbals Decaffeinated Green Tea | |
| 26 | Extract, Camellia Sinesis, Korean Ginseng Pana | x Ginseng, Natural Herbals Eyebright | |
| | | | |
| | -1- COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE | RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES | |

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24 25

26

Euphrasia Officinalis, Ultra Trim Protein Powder 16oz., Super Sterol Protein Complex 90 Tablets, Psyllium Herbal Aide 100 Gelatin Capsules, Herbal Amino-Trim 90 Tablets and Herbal Cal-Aid 100 Tablets containing lead (the "PRODUCTS").

- Lead and lead compounds (hereinafter, the "LISTED CHEMICALS") are 2. substances known to the State¹ of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.
- The use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED 3. CHEMICALS at levels requiring a "clear and reasonable warning" under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code ("H&S Code") §25249.5, et seq. (also known as "Proposition 65"). Defendant(s) has failed to provide the health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 4. Defendant(s)' continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, causes individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the LISTED CHEMICALS that violate Proposition 65.
- Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief enjoining Defendant(s) from the continued 5. manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS in California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS. Plaintiff seeks an injunctive order compelling Defendant(s) to bring its business practices into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been and who in the future may be exposed to LISTED CHEMICALS from the use of the PRODUCTS. Plaintiff also seeks an order compelling Defendant(s) to identify and locate each individual person who in the past has purchased the PRODUCTS, and to provide to each such purchaser a clear and

¹ All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

reasonable warning that the use of the PRODUCTS will cause exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS.

6. In addition to injunctive relief, Plaintiff seeks an assessment of civil penalties to remedy Defendant(s)' failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant(s) because, based on information and belief, Defendant(s) is a business having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally availing itself of the California market through the distribution and sale of the PRODUCTS in the State of California to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 9. Venue in this action is proper in the Los Angeles Superior Court because the Defendant has violated California law in the County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

- 10. PLAINTIFF Environmental Research Center ("PLAINTIFF") is a corporation organized under California's Corporation Law. ERC is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic substances, consumer protection, worker safety and corporate responsibility.
- 11. ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25118 and brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d).
- 12. Defendant VITAMIN POWER INCORPORATED, is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and a person doing business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11 with an office at 39 Saint Marys Pl., Freeport, NY 11520.

- 13. Upon information and belief, and upon that basis, PLAINTIFF alleges that the true names, or capacities of DOES 1 through 10, inclusive (the "DOES"), whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF, who therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Hereinafter, Plaintiff will refer to the named DEFENDANT(S) and DOES collectively as DEFENDANT(S).
- 14. DEFENDANT(S) manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California and in Los Angeles County.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 15. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).
- 16. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....

17. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7.) The phrase "threatening to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial likelihood that a violation will occur." (H&S Code §25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

18. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning

requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") §25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.5, et seq.)

- 19. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993. (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.6, et seq.)
- 20. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based on such information and belief alleges the PRODUCTS have been distributed and/or sold to individuals in California without clear and reasonable warning since at least August 17, 2007. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.
- 21. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANT(S), as a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout the State of California, including in the County of Los Angeles, have been exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS without clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.
- 22. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANT(S) has knowingly and intentionally exposed the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS to LISTED CHEMICALS without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 23. Individuals using or handling the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS in excess of the "maximum allowable daily" and "no significant risk" levels determined by the State of California, as applicable, within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.10(c).
- 24. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANT(S) has, in the course of doing business, failed to provide individuals using and/or handling the PRODUCTS with a clear and

reasonable warning that the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICALS.

25. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite clear and reasonable warning.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in PLAINTIFF's August 17, 2010 and January 14, 2011 60-Day Notice of Violation)

Against All DEFENDANT(S) and DOES

- 26. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 27. On August 17, 2010 and January 14, 2011, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies, and to all DEFENDANTS ("Notices") collectively attached hereto as Exhibit A. The Notices were issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code §25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The notice given included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the violations, and was issued as follows:
 - a. DEFENDANT(S) and the California Attorney General were provided copies of the Notice by Certified Mail.
 - DEFENDANT(S) was provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
 - c. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit

by the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identify of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code \$25249.7(h) (2).

- 28. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.* against DEFENDANT(S) based on the allegations herein.
- 29. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint DEFENDANT(S) at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notices to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 30. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT(S)has violated H&S Code § 25249.6 and is therefore subject to an injunction ordering DEFENDANT(S) to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers and to provide warnings to DEFENDANT(S)' past customers who purchased or used the PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.
- 31. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).
- 32. Continuing commission by DEFENDANT(S), of the acts alleged above will irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays judgment against DEFENDANT(S), as set forth hereafter.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in PLAINTIFF's August 17, 2010 and January 14, 2011 60-Day Notice of Violation)

Against all DEFENDANT(S) and DOES

- 33. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 32, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 34. On August 17, 2010 and January 14, 2011, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies, and to DEFENDANT(S) collectively attached hereto as Exhibit A ("Notices"). The Notices were issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code §25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The notice given included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the violations, and was issued as follows:
 - a. DEFENDANT(S) and the California Attorney General were provided copies of the Notice by Certified Mail.
 - b. DEFENDANT(S) was provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
 - c. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identify of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts

studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h) (2).

- 35. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, et seq. against DEFENDANT(S) based on the allegations herein.
- 36. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT(S) at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notices to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 37. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT(S) is liable, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure to a LISTED CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays judgment against DEFENDANT(S), as set forth hereafter.

THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 38. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 37, as if set forth below.
- 39. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT(S) has caused irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, DEFENDANT(S) will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, PLAINTIFF accordingly prays for the following relief:

A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b),



Environmental Research Center

5694 Mission Center Road #199 San Diego, CA 92108 619.309.4194

August 17, 2010

| VIA CERTIFIED MAIL | VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL |
|---|---|
| | District Attorneys of All California Counties |
| Current CEO or President | and Select City Attorneys |
| Vitamin Power Incorporated | (See Attached Certificate of Service) |
| 39 Saint Marys Pl | |
| Freeport, NY - 11520 | |
| | |
| Office of the California Attorney General | |
| Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting | |
| 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 | |
| P.O. Box 70550 | |
| Oakland, CA 94612-0550 | |

Re: Notice of Violations of Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6

Dear Addressees:

The Environmental Research Center ("ERC"), the noticing entity, is a non-profit California corporation, located at 5694 Mission Center Road, #199, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 309-4194. ERC's mission is to help safeguard the public from health hazards that impact families, workers, and the environment. ERC is dedicated to reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility. Through this Notice of Violation, ERC seeks to reduce the public's exposure from lead that is contained in the products identified below.

This letter constitutes notification that **Vitamin Power Incorporated**, located at 39 Saint Marys Pl Freeport, NY - 11520, violated the warning requirement of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (commencing with Section 25249.5 of the California Health & Safety Code).

In particular, Vitamin Power Incorporated has manufactured, marketed, distributed, and/or sold products that have exposed and continue to expose numerous individuals within California to lead. The primary route of exposure has been oral through ingestion. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead as chemical known to cause cancer.

Vitamin Power Incorporated is exposing people to lead from the following products:

Vitamin Power Ultra Herbal Allergy Aid Capsules Vitamin Power Natural Herbals Decaffeinated Green Tea Extract Camellia Sinesis Vitamin Power Natural Herbals Korean Ginseng Panax Ginseng Vitamin Power Natural Herbals Eyebright Euphrasia Officinalis

Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to certain listed chemicals. Vitamin Power Incorporated is in violation of Proposition 65 because it failed to provide a warning to persons using these products that they are being exposed to lead. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. Vitamin Power Incorporated has failed to give such a warning.

Proposition 65 requires that notice of violation be given sixty days before a citizen enforcement suit is filed. With this letter, ERC gives notice of the violation to Vitamin Power Incorporated and the appropriate governmental authorities. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 involving Vitamin Power Incorporated currently known to ERC from the information now available. ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, has been provided to Vitamin Power Incorporated along with this letter.

Based on the allegations in this notice, ERC intends to file a citizen enforcement action against Vitamin Power Incorporated unless the company agrees in an enforceable written instrument to resolve this matter prior to suit being filed. ERC remains open to resolving its grievances short of formal litigation. Such resolution will avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to lead and expensive and time consuming litigation.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to ERC's attorney, Karen A. Evans, 4218 Biona Pl., San Diego, CA 92116, telephone no.: 619-640-8100, e-mail: kaevans1@cox.net.

Sincerely,

Chris Heptinstall Executive Director

Environmental Research Center

cc: Karen Evans

Enclosures

OEHHA Summary (Vitamin Power Incorporated only)
Certificate of Merit (additional required supporting documentation to AG only)
Certificate of Service
List of Service

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and its implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information. Proposition 65 appears in California law as Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 12000 through 14000.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Governor's List." Proposition 65 requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm. This list must be updated at least once a year. Over 550 chemicals have been listed as of May 1, 1996. Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under this law. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving those chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed. Exposures are exempt from the warning requirement if they occur less than twelve months after the date of listing of the chemical.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Discharges are exempt from this requirement if they occur less than twenty months after the date of listing of the chemical.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. The law exempts:

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, State or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed as known to the State to cause cancer ("carcinogens"), a warning is not required if the business can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "no significant risk" levels for more than 250 listed carcinogens. Exposures that will produce

no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm ("reproductive toxicants"), a warning is not required if the business can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level (NOEL)," divided by a 1,000-fold safety or uncertainty factor. The "no observable effect level" is the highest dose level which has not been associated with an observable adverse reproductive or developmental effect. Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering into any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not enter any drinking water source, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" or "no observable effect" test if an individual were exposed to such an amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys (those in cities with a population exceeding 750,000). Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. A notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in regulations (Title 22, California Code of Regulations, Section 12903). A private party may not pursue an enforcement action directly under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an action within sixty days of the notice. A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court of law to stop committing the violation.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7 (d)

- I, Karen A. Evans hereby declare:
- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the Notice of Violation in which it is alleged that the party identified in the Notice has violated Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- 2. I am the attorney for the noticing party Environmental Research Center ("ERC"). ERC is dedicated to reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees and encouraging corporate responsibility. The Notice of Violation alleges that the party identified has exposed persons in California to lead from products that it manufactures and distributes. Please refer to the Notice of Violation for additional details regarding the alleged violations.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the alleged exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the action. In particular, I have reviewed the resulting data from the laboratory that conducted the testing to determine the concentration of lead in the products identified in the Notice of Violation and I have relied on the testing results. The testing was conducted by a reputable testing laboratory with substantial experience in testing for lead. These facts, studies or other data derived through this investigation overwhelmingly demonstrate that the party identified in the Notice of Violation exposes persons to lead through oral exposure (ingestion).
- 4. Based on my consultation with persons of appropriate experience, the results of the laboratory testing, as well as published studies on lead, it is clear that there is sufficient evidence that human exposures exist from exposure to the products from the noticed party.

Furthermore, as a result of the above, I have concluded that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and the information did not prove that the alleged violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the California Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7 (h) (2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: August 17, 2010

Karen A. Evans

Attorney for Environmental Research Center

Karen a. Evans

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742

On August 17, 2010, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 *ET SEQ.*; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986: A SUMMARY"

On the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current CEO or President Vitamin Power Incorporated 39 Saint Marys Pl Freeport, NY – 11520

On August 17, 2010, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT (including supporting documentation required by Title 11 CCR §3102) on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office for delivery by Certified Mail:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Post Office Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On August 17, 2010, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on August 17, 2010, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Chris Heptinstall

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Room 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, #202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 547 Market Street Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Ste. 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, #1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 939 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County Post Office Drawer D Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301 District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Lassen County 220 South Lassen Street, Ste. 8 Susanville, CA 96130

District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Rm 345 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 2222 "M" Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Monterey County 230 Church Street, Bldg 2 Salinas, CA 93901

District Attorney, Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559

District Attorney, Nevada County 110 Union Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 Civic Center Drive West Santa Ana, CA 92701 District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95603

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, Riverside County 4075 Main Street, 1st Floor Riverside, CA 92501

District Attorney, Sacramento County 901 "G" Street Sacramento, CA 95814

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Room 1300 San Diego, CA 92112

District Attorney, San Francisco County 850 Bryant Street, Room 325 San Francsico, CA 94103

District Attorney, San Joaquin County Post Office Box 990 Stockton, CA 95202

District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1050 Monterey Street, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1105 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Santa Clara County 70 West Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060

District Attorney, Shasta County 1525 Court Street, Third Floor Redding, CA 96001-1632

District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2nd Floor Downieville, CA 95936 District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Sonoma County 600 Administration Drive, Room 212J Santa Rosa, CA 95403

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95353

District Attorney, Sutter County 446 Second Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tulare County 221 S. Mooney Avenue, Room 224 Visalia, CA 93291

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Ventura County 800 South Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009

District Attorney, Yolo County 301 2nd Street Woodland, CA 95695

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Rm 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco City Attorney's Office City Hall, Room 234 San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street San Jose, CA 95113



Environmental Research Center

5694 Mission Center Road #199 San Diego, CA 92108 619.309.4194

January 14, 2011

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Current CEO or President Vitamin Power Incorporated 39 Saint Mary's Place Freeport, NY 11520

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

Re: Notice of Violation against Vitamin Power Incorporated for Violation of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6

Dear Prosecutors:

The Environmental Research Center ("ERC"), the noticing entity is a California corporation whose mission is to safeguard the public from health hazards that impact families, workers and the environment. ERC is dedicated to reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees and encouraging corporate responsibility. ERC is located at 5694 Mission Center Road, # 199, San Diego, CA 92108. Tel. (619) 309-4194, Executive Director: Chris Heptinstall. Through this Notice of Violation, ERC seeks to reduce exposure to the public from lead that is contained in the named products manufactured and distributed by Vitamin Power Incorporated.

This letter constitutes notification that Vitamin Power Incorporated, located at 39 Saint Mary's Place, Freeport, NY 11520, has violated the warning requirement of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (commencing with section 25249.5 of the Health and Safety Code).

In particular, this Company has manufactured and distributed products that have exposed and continue to expose numerous individuals within California to lead. Lead was listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity on February 27, 1987. Lead was listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a carcinogen on October 1, 1992. The time period of these violations commenced one year after the listed dates above, at least since January 14, 2008, as well as every day since the products were introduced in the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users.

The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of these products by consumers. Accordingly, the primary route of exposure for consumers has been oral through ingestion, but may also occur through the inhalation and/or dermal contact route of exposure.

Vitamin Power Incorporated is exposing people to lead from the following products:

Vitamin Power Inc. Ultra Trim Protein Powder 16 oz. Vitamin Power Inc. Super Sterol Protein Complex 90 Tablets Vitamin Power Inc. Psyllium Herbal Aide 100 Gelatin Capsules

Vitamin Power Inc. Herbal Amino-Trim 90 Tablets Vitamin Power Inc. Herbal Calm-Aid 100 Tablets

Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to certain listed chemicals. Vitamin Power Incorporated is in violation of Proposition 65 because the Company failed to provide a warning to persons using their products that they are being exposed to lead. (22 C.C.R. section 12601.) While in the course of doing business, the company is knowingly and intentionally exposing people to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warning. (Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.) The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. 22 C.C.R. section 12601 (b)(1) (A).

Proposition 65 requires that notice and intent to sue be given to a violator 60-days before the suit is filed. With this letter, ERC gives notice of the alleged violation to the noticed party and the appropriate governmental authorities. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 that are currently known to ERC from information now available. ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and referenced as Appendix A, has been provided to the noticed party.

Based on the allegations set forth in this Notice, ERC intends to file a citizen enforcement action against Vitamin Power Incorporated unless it agrees in an enforceable written instrument to: instrument to: (1) recall or reformulate the listed products so as to eliminate further unwarned exposures to the identified chemicals; and (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution to this matter. Such resolution will avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals and expensive and time consuming litigation.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to ERC's attorney, Gideon Kracov, 801 S. Grand Ave., 11th Fl., Los Angeles, CA 90017, 213-629-2071, gk@gideonlaw.net.

Sincerely,

Chris Heptinstall
Executive Director
Environmental Research Center

cc: Karen A. Evans

Attachments
Certificate of Merit
Certificate of Service
OEHHA Summary (to Vitamin Power Incorporated only)
Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center's Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Vitamin Power Incorporated

I, Gideon Kracov, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: January 14, 2011

Gideon Kracov, Attorney At Law

Milea Lona

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742

On January 14, 2011, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY"

On the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current CEO or President Vitamin Power Incorporated 39 Saint Mary's Place Freeport, NY 11520

On January 14, 2011, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office for delivery by Certified Mail:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Post Office Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On January 14, 2011, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on January 14, 2011, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Chris Heptinstall

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Room 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, #202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 547 Market Street Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Ste. 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, #1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 939 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County 230 W. Line Street Bishop, CA 93514

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301 District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Lassen County 220 South Lassen Street, Ste. 8 Susanville, CA 96130

District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Rm 345 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 2222 M Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Monterey County 230 Church Street, Bldg 2 Salinas, CA 93901

District Attorney, Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559

District Attorney, Nevada County 110 Union Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 Civic Center Drive West Santa Ana, CA 92701

> District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, Riverside County 4075 Main Street, 1st Floor Riverside, CA 92501

District Attorney, Sacramento County 901 "G" Street Sacramento, CA 9581

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Room 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Francisco County 850 Bryant Street, Room 325 San Francsico, CA 94103

District Attorney, San Joaquin County Post Office Box 990 Stockton, CA 95201

District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1050 Monterey Street, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1105 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Santa Clara County 70 West Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060

District Attorney, Shasta County 1525 Court Street, Third Floor Redding, CA 96001-1632

District Attorney, Sierra County PO Box 457 Downieville, CA 95936 District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Sonoma County 600 Administration Drive, Room 212J Santa Rosa, CA 95403

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95353

District Attorney, Sutter County 446 Second Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tulare County 221 S. Mooney Avenue, Room 224 Visalia, CA 93291

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Ventura County 800 South Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009

District Attorney, Yolo County 301 2nd Street Woodland, CA 95695

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Rm 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco City Attorney's Office City Hall, Room 234 1 Drive Carlton B Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street San Jose, CA 95113

| ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar | number, and address): | FOR COURT USE ONLY |
|---|--|---|
| ATTORNEY OR PARTY MITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar. Gideon Kracov (SBN 179815) | 7A 00017 | |
| 801 S. Grand Ave., 11th Fl., Los Angeles, 0 | JA 70017 | |
| | | CONFORMED COPY |
| TELEPHONE NO.: 213-629-2071 | FAX NO.: | OF ORIGINAL FILED |
| ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Environmental Resea | rch Center | OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court |
| SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF | | |
| STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill St. | | APR () 1 2011 |
| mailing address: 111 N. Hill St. | | सर्हमा |
| city and zip code: Los Angeles, CA 900 | 12 | John A. grades and J. |
| BRANCH NAME: Mosk | | IN TO POLO ENGUIDA OTROET/CIANT |
| CASE NAME: | | John A. Flora, Executive Officer/Biens DOROTHY SWAIN |
| Environmental Research Center v. V | itamin Power Incorporated | DOUGLUL SWAIN 4 |
| CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET | Complex Case Designation | CASE NUMBER: |
| ✓ Unlimited | | BC458576 |
| (Amount (Amount | Counter Joinder | 1 |
| demanded demanded is | Filed with first appearance by defen | dant JUDGE: |
| exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less) | (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402) | DEPT: |
| Items 1–6 beld | ow must be completed (see instructions | on page 2). |
| 1. Check one box below for the case type that | best describes this case: | |
| Auto Tort | Contract | Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation |
| Auto (22) | Breach of contract/warranty (06) | (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) |
| Uninsured motorist (46) | Rule 3.740 collections (09) | Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) |
| Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property | Other collections (09) | Construction defect (10) |
| Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort | Insurance coverage (18) | Mass tort (40) |
| Asbestos (04) | Other contract (37) | Securities litigation (28) |
| Product liability (24) | Real Property | Environmental/Toxic tort (30) |
| Medical malpractice (45) | Eminent domain/Inverse | [] |
| Other PI/PD/WD (23) | condemnation (14) | Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case |
| Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort | Wrongful eviction (33) | types (41) |
| , , , , | Other and asserts (OC) | Enforcement of Judgment |
| Business tort/unfair business practice (07) | Unlawful Detainer | Enforcement of judgment (20) |
| Civil rights (08) | | , ~ ` ` ' |
| Defamation (13) | Commercial (31) | Miscellaneous Civil Complaint |
| Fraud (16) | Residential (32) | RICO (27) |
| Intellectual property (19) | Drugs (38) | Other complaint (not specified above) (42) |
| Professional negligence (25) | Judicial Review | Miscellaneous Civil Petition |
| Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) | Asset forfeiture (05) | Partnership and corporate governance (21) |
| Employment | Petition re: arbitration award (11) | Other petition (not specified above) (43) |
| Wrongful termination (36) | Writ of mandate (02) | |
| Other employment (15) | Other judicial review (39) | |
| 2. This case is is is not comp | olex under rule 3.400 of the California Ri | ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the |
| factors requiring exceptional judicial manage | gement: | |
| a. Large number of separately repres | sented parties d. 🔛 Large numbe | er of witnesses |
| b. Extensive motion practice raising of | difficult or novel e. Coordination | with related actions pending in one or more courts |
| issues that will be time-consuming | | ties, states, or countries, or in a federal court |
| c. Substantial amount of documentar | promote the second seco | ostjudgment judicial supervision |
| | · | |
| 3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. | monetary b. ✓ nonmonetary; o | declaratory or injunctive relief cpunitive |
| 4. Number of causes of action (specify): 2 | | |
| 5. This case is is is not a clas | s action suit. | |
| 6. If there are any known related cases, file a | nd serve a notice of related case. (You i | may use form CM-q15.) |
| Data: | | IA- |
| Date: 2/4/11 | L | |
| (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) | | SIGNATURE OF PARTY OF ATTORNEY FOR PARTY) |
| (HEORITHM AUG) | NOTICE | |
| Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the file | | |
| under the Probate Code, Family Code, or V | | es of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result |
| in sanctions. | ar about required by food accordants | |
| • File this cover sheet in addition to any cover | | ı must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all |
| ather portion to the notion or proceeding | | - • |
| Unless this is a collections case under rule | 3.740 or a complex case, this cover she | eet will be used for statistical purposes only. Page 1 of 2 |
| | ······································ | |
| Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California | CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET | Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400–3.403, 3.740; Cal. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10 |
| CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007] | | www.courtinfo.ca.gov |

| SHORT TITLE: | CASE NUMBER | BC45857 |
|---|-------------|---------|
| Enviro. Research Center v. Vitamin Power Incorporated | | .00376 |

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

| n II ep lef ep ep an | . Select the correct dis- 1: After first completing the margin below, and, to complete the complete the margin below, and, to complete the control of the | trict and courthouse location (4 steps – If you checked "Limited Case", sking the Civil Case Cover Sheet Form, find the main civil case cover sheet by the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected or Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the natural enterest the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action art location, see Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0. **Ite Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C belowed in the County Courthouse, Central District.** **Ite County | neading for your case ed. e of this case. you have checked. v) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| ∍p | 4: Fill in the information | on requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration | |
| | A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No. | B Type of Action (Check only one) | C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above |
| | Auto (22) | ☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death | 1., 2., 4. |
| | Uninsured Motorist (46) | ☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death — Uninsured Motorist | 1., 2., 4. |
| | | ☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage | 2. |
| | Asbestos (04) | A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death | 2. |
| | Product Liability (24) | ☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) | 1., 2., 3., 4., 8. |
| | Medical Malpractice (45) | A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons | 1., 2., 4. |
| | Miculai Mapacaco (10) | A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice | 1., 2., 4. |
| | Other | ☐ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) ☐ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., | 1., 2., 4. |
| | Personal Injury Property Damage | assault, vandalism, etc.) | 1., 2., 4. |
| | Wrongful Death | A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress | 1., 2., 3. |
| | (23) | ☐ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death | 1., 2., 4. |
| Damage/Wrongful Death Tort | Business Tort (07) | ☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract) | 1., 2., 3. |
| | Civil Rights (08) | ☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination | 1., 2., 3. |
| | Defamation (13) | ☐ A6010 Defamation (stander/libel) | 1., 2., 3. |
| | L | ☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract) | |

LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04

| Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage | Wrongful Death Tort (Cont'd.) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Employment | rithioyulait. |

#.

Real Property

| Detainer |
|----------|
| Unlawful |
| Review |
| Judicial |

| SHORT TITLE: | CASE NUMBER |
|---|-------------|
| Enviro. Research Center v. Vitamin Power Incorporated | |

| A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No. | B Type of Action (Check only one) | C Applicable Reasons -See Step 3 Above |
|--|---|--|
| Professional Negligence (25) | ☐ A6017 Legal Malpractice ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) | 1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3. |
| Other (35) | ☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort | 2.,3. |
| Wrongful Termination (36) | ☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination | 1., 2., 3. |
| Other Employment (15) | ☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals | 1., 2., 3. 10. |
| Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance) | □ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not Unlawful Detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) □ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) | 2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. |
| Collections (09) | ☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case | 2., 5., 6. 2., 5. |
| Insurance Coverage (18) | ☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex) | 1., 2., 5., 8. |
| Other Contract (37) | ☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud ☐ A6031 Tortious Interference ☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) | 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8. |
| Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) | ☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels | 2. |
| Wrongful Eviction (33) | ☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case | 2., 6. |
| Other Real Property (26) | ☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure ☐ A6032 Quiet Title ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) | 2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6. |
| Unlawful Detainer- Commercial (31) | ☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) | 2., 6. |
| Unlawful Detainer- Residential (32) | ☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) | 2., 6. |
| Unlawful Detainer- Drugs (38) | ☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs | 2., 6. |
| Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition re Arbitration (11) | ☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case ☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration | 2., 6. 2., 5. |

| B Type of Action (Check only one) | C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above |
|--|--|
| ☐ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus | 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter | 2. |
| ☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review | 2. |
| ☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review | 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation | 1., 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6007 Construction defect | 1., 2., 3. |
| ☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort | 1., 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case | 1., 2., 8. |
| ☑ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental | 1.(2.]3., 8. |
| ☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only) | 1., 2., 5., 8. |
| ☐ A6141 Sister State Judgment ☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment ☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) ☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) ☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax ☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case | 2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9. |
| ☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case | 1., 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only ☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) ☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) ☐ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) | 1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case | 2., 8. |
| ☐ A6121 Civil Harassment ☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment ☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case ☐ A6190 Election Contest ☐ A6110 Petition for Change of Name ☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law ☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition | 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. |
| | Type of Action (Check only one) A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review A6007 Construction defect A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort A6005 Securities Litigation Case A6006 Toxic Tort/Environmental A6001 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only) A6001 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only) A6101 A6101 Abstract of Judgment A6102 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) A6104 Affilia Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) A6104 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case A6003 Racketeering (RICO) Case A6004 Injunctive Relief Only A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case A6121 Civil Harassment A6123 Workplace Harassment A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case A6190 Election Contest A6101 Petition for Change of Name A6110 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law |

| Enviro. Research Center | v. vitam | in Power Inco | Iporated |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---|
| | | | accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected. |
| REASON: CHECK THE NI WHICH APPLIE □1. ☑2. □3. □4. □5. □ | ES IN THIS CA | SE | ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill St. |
| CITY: Los Angeles | STATE: | ZIP CODE: 90012 | |
| irue and correct and that the ab | ove-entitled n | natter is properly t | perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is filed for assignment to the Moskcourthouse in the r Court (Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and LASC Local Rule 2.0, |

CASE NUMBER

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

1. Original Complaint or Petition.

SHORT TITLE:

- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet form CM-010.
- 4. Complete Addendum to Civil Case Cover Sheet form LACIV 109 (Rev. 01/07), LASC Approved 03-04.
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. Signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, JC form FL-935, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age, or if required by Court.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.